

**Medford District  
Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)  
Meeting Minutes**

**April 11, 2002  
Bureau of Land Management  
Medford District Office**

The objectives of the Committee are to improve collaborative relationships between the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and local communities, and provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) or the Secretary's designee(s) consistent with the provisions of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, P.L. 106-393.

---

***MEMBERS PRESENT***

**Category 1**

Gene Bowling  
Amy Burrows  
Daniel Ratty  
David Hill

**Category 2**

Phillip Lang  
Richard Smith  
Jack Shipley  
David Strahan  
Vernon Pew  
Howard Heiner - Alternate  
Jeff Hanson - Alternate

**Category 3**

George Fence  
Susan Morgan  
Steve West

***Welcome - Steve West, Vice Chair***

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Steve West, Vice Chair. Sue Kupillas is recuperating from surgery and unable to attend.

RAC members, BLM support staff and others in attendance introduced themselves.

***Review Agenda - Karen Gillespie, Facilitator***

Agenda was reviewed and approved.

***Review/Approve Meeting Minutes***

Approval of the minutes was postponed until the afternoon session to give members time to review the minutes of the 3/27/02 meeting.

***Action Item Follow-up/Reports***

**Alternates' Travel & Per Diem - Ron Wenker**

Ron handed out a memo from the BLM Oregon State Office (attached) concerning Use of Alternates on Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Committees in the State of Oregon. The memo quotes from the Charter, "The Role of the alternate will be to fill vacancies on the

Committee that occur in accordance with number 10". The memo further states, an alternate is not deemed to be a member until such time as they fill a vacated member position.

Discussion:

- Committee asked if they could decide on their own to pay travel and per diem?
- The role of the Committee is to give BLM recommendations on spending Title II monies. Committee doesn't have authority to spend dollars. District Manager doesn't have authority to spend dollars in that fashion.
- Committee asked if there was any opportunity for feedback to the Secretary of the Interior to explain their position on this matter.
- Yes. The Committee can pass a resolution for Ron to take forward.

The Committee drafted the following motion.

The BLM will forward to the Secretary that the RAC recommends that Alternates participate fully in the process, including being compensated for travel, with the caveat being that the Alternates would not vote in their capacity as Alternates.

The Committee voted unanimously to forward proposal to the Secretary of the Interior.

Cost Share County's Funds - Ron Wenker

- We have the ability to do this.
- County may not have projects in specific year and could give up their dollars to another project in another county. In subsequent years, this would be taken into account when deciding project priority.
- How do we ensure dollars are spent equally?
- BLM will be keep a close accounting of expenditures by county. When we propose projects that cross county boundaries, we hope we can sell it to the county. Hope counties are flexible.
- Projects are presented to counties first. Goal is to see projects done, enhance forest health, create jobs.
- Equity of spending lies with County Commissioners.
- Keeping strict accounting of dollars. Unspent dollars will be carried over to next year.
- Are regional projects feasible?  
Will take coordination between RACs (BLM & FS). Small diameter projects are good example. No reason we can't propose projects across regional boundaries.

Contact with ODF on Cost Per Acre for Cost Share Programs - Rich Drehobl

See attached handouts.

Road Decommissioning & Obliteration - Jon Raby, Butte Falls Resource Area

At the 3/27/02 RAC meeting, the Committee tabled the Maple Gulch and Big Butte road decommissioning projects. BLM was asked for more information on these projects and road decommissioning in general before making a decision to fund these projects.

Jon Raby's Power Point presentation attached.

Discussion:

Maple Gulch

- % In riparian zone? Yes.
- % Is it affecting fish bearing streams? Yes.
- % Have the landowners expressed concerns? No.

- Oregon Guides & Packers have concerns about road decommissioning.
- There are different levels of decommissioning from total obliteration to low maintenance.
- If not contributing to siltation of streams, need to leave roads for recreation purposes.
- BLM looks at roads creating problems (i.e., dumping, siltation, etc.).
- Obliteration projects only involve 4.7 miles of roads. This is a drop in the bucket compared to the amount of roads per square mile in the Butte Falls RA.

A motion was made to support obliteration projects as presented. Motion seconded. Maple Gulch and Big Butte projects approved by the Committee.

***Review/Approve Meeting Minutes - Steve West***

In reviewing the minutes it was noted that the Josephine County projects presentation had been omitted.

Motion made to approve notes on condition that Josephine County projects be added. Motion seconded. The amended minutes from 3/27/02 meeting were approved by the Committee.

***Public Comment***

None.

***Proposed Change to Agenda***

A proposal was made to work through lunch and adjourn early. Agenda called for another Public Comment period in the afternoon portion of the meeting and some members had made other commitments for their lunch period. Therefore, the Committee decided to stay with the agenda as it had been approved.

***2003 Process***

Bob Korfhage, Project Coordinator, furnished members with a handout containing the Key Dates for the 2003 Projects. To complete this list of dates, the Committee needed to decide if they wanted field trips and to also decide on their next meeting dates.

Discussion:

- Decision on field trips is up to RAC to decide.
- Suggestion was made that each group could look at different projects and report back to the committee as a whole.
  - % This brought up the issue of a quorum.
  - % Meetings of small groups of less than a quorum don't have to be published in the Federal Register (because they are not an official meeting).
  - % If not an official meeting, expenses are not covered.

- Proposal was made for two field trips. One to look at 2002 projects and one to look at 2003 projects.
- Question: Is non attendance at field trips counted against members?  
Answer: As with meetings, we will look at circumstances.
- Roads are of primary interest. Can see culvert replacements in photos but more helpful to actually see road projects.
- Suggestion made for a representative from each group to meet with BLM to review projects and recommend to Committee those to see on-the-ground.

Committee approved this recommendation and selected the following members to meet with Bob Korfhage. Bob's email address is: [www.Bob\\_Korfhage@or.blm.gov](mailto:www.Bob_Korfhage@or.blm.gov)

Gene Bowling	Howard Heiner
Dave Hill	Richard Smith
Susan Morgan	

The Committee chose the following dates for their field trips and meetings.

Field Trips

% July 11, 7:00 a.m. @ Medford BLM

% July 25, 7:00 a.m. @ Medford BLM

Future Meetings

% August 8 @ Medford BLM

% August 22 @ Medford BLM

Ron Wenker stated that the RAC meetings can be held at other locations throughout the counties involved in the Medford BLM RAC. The Committee discussed and decided for the upcoming meetings they preferred the facilities at the Medford BLM office and that it was more convenient for the BLM staff. The Committee is open to meeting elsewhere if any of the counties issue an invitation to do so.

Guidelines for 2003 Projects

- Info on native seedings
  - Background
  - Benefits, relevance
- Concern about getting more private project submissions.
- One concern for more ecosystem health projects.
- Need for unbiased presentation on what priorities and needs should be.
- All new what we're doing. Need to consider quality of projects.
- Keep options open. Will have some diverse proposals.
- Since this is county money, need to hear from county constituents.
- RAC should be wary of limiting scope.
- Want to review materials being used to market ideas. Might have suggestions for approval.
- BLM should promote RAC's activities in media.
- RAC should be careful about labels for project categories.
- RAC should review outreach procedures and resources.
- RAC should look at how to help private individuals develop better proposals.

***Public Comment***

None.

## ***BIN List***

### **Contracting Process**

Need monitoring, follow-up/reports on progress and accomplishments.

Is this RAC's responsibility? No.


- BLM will be tracking costs, contract administration, monitoring of projects.

Will be accountable to the RAC.

RAC wants progress chart of projects at each meeting.

### ***Action Items***

- **Action Item (Ron Wenker):** Forward RAC proposal for travel and per diem for alternates to Secretary.
- **Action Item (Bob Korfhage):** progress chart of projects at each meeting.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Mede West, Vice Chair  
Resource Advisory Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date 8/8/2002

### **Attachments (4)**

- 1 - Information Bulletin, Use of Alternates
- 2 - ODF Process for Determining Fire Hazard Reduction Rates
- 3 - Hand and Mechanical Techniques to Reduce Fire Hazard
- 4 - Power Point Presentation, Road Decommissioning

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Oregon State Office  
P.O. Box 2965  
Portland, Oregon 97208**

**In Reply Refer to:**  
1379 (OR933) P

March 27, 2002

EMS TRANSMISSION 03/27/2002  
Information Bulletin No. OR-2002-129

To: District Managers: Coos Bay, Eugene, Lakeview, Medford, Roseburg and Salem; Field Manager, Klamath Falls

From: Deputy State Director for Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Subject: Use of Alternates on Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Committees in the State of Oregon

Questions have arisen in regarding the use of alternates (i.e. participation) for Resource Advisory Committees (RAC). Guidance on use of alternates is contained in sections 10 and 11 of the RAC charters. Section 10 (e) states that "Vacancies will be filled by the alternates for the category for which a Committee position is vacant." "The role of the alternate will be to fill vacancies on the Committee that occur in accordance with number 10." The intent of the legislation, P.L. 106-393, is to select alternates as pre-approved replacements for RAC members. It was not intended for alternates to be substitutes for RAC members in their absence. Therefore, alternates should participate as members of the public at RAC meetings until such time as they fill a vacant member position.

Another concern was the appropriateness of reimbursing alternates for travel and per diem. The RAC Charters address this under 10.i. "Committee members serve without monetary compensation, but will be reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses when on Committee business, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5703." Again, an alternate is not deemed to be a member until such time as they fill a vacated member position.

**Districts with Unions** are reminded to notify their unions of this IB and satisfy any bargaining obligations before implementation. Your Servicing Personnel Office or Labor Relations Specialist can provide you assistance in this matter.

Signed By  
Edward W. Shepard

Authenticated By  
Cindy Fredrickson  
Management Assistant

## ODF Process for Determining Fire Hazard Reduction Rates

These are the landowner cost-share rates used in Oregon by the state (and Farm Services, etc). Surprisingly, there really isn't anything formally written for the process. The first 5 pages are the SIP (Stewardship Incentive Program) practice codes and rates. These are followed by the rates for 4 additional grants currently available. Grants 2-4 are specific to the National Fire Plan.

The rates listed are 75% of the maximum amount allowed for the practice. This is the maximum amount that the grant will fund. For example, if a landowner has a new stewardship plan developed for 10-25 acres, PG 1, component code SA1, the maximum amount allowed would be:

75% landowner reimbursement	\$575 (from table)
25% landowner obligation	\$192
Total	\$767

If the total cost of the plan were \$400, then the landowner would be reimbursed \$300 (75%).

The process is this

- ! Landowner fills out application and sends to ODF or Farm Service
- ! ODF meeting with landowner on-site and completes application and assigns practice codes and rates.
- ! ODF approves application
- ! Landowner has work completed or completes the work themselves.
- ! Landowner submits receipts and request for payment.
- ! ODF inspects work.
- ! ODF reimburses landowner.

The home site (defensible space) grant program is a bit simpler. It's a rebate and receipts are not required. The rebate amounts are based upon the SIP rates, but lumped into one to three categories for simplicity of administration. Some of the geographic areas are using a flat \$300 per area/home. Others are using a range of \$210, 330 and 580 per acre/home for light, moderate, and heavy work.

## But What Can I Do about It, Anyway?

### Hand and Mechanical Techniques to Reduce Fire Hazard

The following chart should be useful to any landowner - or land manager - interested in reducing the risk of catastrophic fire in a particular site by reducing the build-up of fuel. The methods described apply to both surface fuels (those on the ground or close to the ground) and aerial fuels (tree crowns), and they address the type, amount, size, and distribution of fuel, the height of a tree from its bottom to its crown, and the amount of crown fuel within a given area. They are classified into three categories: methods using hand tools in the Manual category; methods using large machinery in the Mechanical category; and prescribed fire and other methods (such as grazing) in the category of that name. Each of these methods may treat one or more of these elements of hazardous fuels. Depending upon the site, only a few might be considered complete treatments in that they can be used to treat most (if not all) of a site's hazardous fuels. Most are partial treatments in that they must be used with other treatments in order to effectively reduce fuel hazard.

Prior to deciding to use any particular treatment the landowner should understand clearly his or her objectives for the land and consider many other aspects of land management. It would be a good idea to consult with a professional in fire prevention and vegetation treatment before designing any hazardous fuel reduction project. Following are some issues - not all, but the major ones - that a landowner might wish to consider when deciding on a treatment strategy:

- ! Treatment objectives (the overall objective and any site-specific objectives)
- ! Site conditions (access; topography; type, amount and distribution of fuel or vegetation; soils; existing site development; etc.)
- ! Cost of treatment
- ! Source and amount of available funds
- ! Time available to complete the project
- ! Size of area to be treated
- ! Concerns about resources and values (For example: How much damage to residual trees, lawns, soils is acceptable?)
- ! Acceptability of risk to landowner (How much risk am I willing to accept if something goes wrong: damage to residual trees, escaped fire, etc.?)
- ! Availability of liability insurance, etc.
- ! Personal interest, experience, and physical capability and skill in use of the equipment (How much, if any, of the work do I want to do myself?)